


<b>PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW</b>		Docket Number <b>Q79997</b>	
Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	Application Number	Filed	
	10/781,911	February 20, 2004	
	First Named Inventor		
	Seigo NISHIKAWA		
	Art Unit	Examiner	
	1725	Clifford C. Shaw	
<p style="text-align: center;">WASHINGTON OFFICE <b>23373</b> CUSTOMER NUMBER</p>			
<p>Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.</p> <p>This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.</p> <p>The review is requested for the reasons stated on the attached sheets. Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.</p>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I am an attorney or agent of record. Registration number <u>43,355</u>		 _____ Signature	
		<u>Chid S. Iyer</u> Typed or printed name	
		<u>(202) 293-7060</u> Telephone number	
		<u>July 28, 2006</u> Date	

**PATENT APPLICATION**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of

Docket No: Q79997

Seigo NISHIKAWA, et al.

Appln. No.: 10/781,911

Group Art Unit: 1725

Confirmation No.: 5337

Examiner: Clifford C. Shaw

Filed: February 20, 2004

For: ARC WELDER

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

**MAIL STOP AF - PATENTS**

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Pursuant to the new Pre-Appeal Brief Conference Pilot Program, and further to the Examiner's Final Office Action dated February 1, 2006, Applicant files this Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review. This Request is also accompanied by the filing of a Notice of Appeal.

Applicant turns now to the rejections at issue:

Claims 1-3 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terayama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,645,741) taken with Stava (U.S. Patent No. 5,148,001).

The focus of the disagreement between the Applicant and the Examiner thus far has to do with the Examiner's incorrect understanding and interpretation of the teachings of Terayama.

The present invention, as recited in claim 1, requires a rectifier circuit that converts an AC into a DC. An inverter circuit converts the output of the rectifier circuit to a high-frequency AC. A transformer converts the output of the inverter circuit to a voltage suitable for arc

welding. A second rectifier circuit rectifies the output of the transformer to a DC. A first reactor is connected to the second rectifier circuit. Importantly, a current circuit is connected in parallel to the second rectifier circuit with a reactance that is larger than a reactance of the first reactor.

In rejecting the claims of the present Application the Examiner contends that

The Applicant argues that his claims distinguish over Tereyama et al. (5,645,741) because of the language directed to the different voltages applied to the current circuit and to the second rectifier circuit. This argument is not persuasive. In the voltage/current graphs in Fig. 3 of Tereyama et al. (5,645,741) clearly shows that his auxillary power supply has a larger open circuit voltage than the main power supply. Since both the auxillary and main power supplies are connected to the same transformer primary, the only way to achieve this difference in voltages is by providing different secondary windings for T1, with a higher voltage being provided to the auxiliary source to achieve the disclosed higher output voltage.

Final Office Action at page 4. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Figs. 3 & 5 of Tereyama clearly show the same number of secondary windings for the coil providing power to DR4 and DR2. There appears to be no discussion in Terayama contradicting this. Therefore, the Examiner is clearly mischaracterizing the teachings of Terayama.

To the contrary, in the present invention, the output voltage of the current circuit 10 is consistently higher than the output voltage of the second rectifier circuit 5. Specifically, the examples of Figs. 1 and 2 of the present invention shows that the ratio of the output voltages are 3:2, according to the ratio of the numbers of the windings of the transformer 4.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW  
U.S. Patent Application No.: 10/781,911  
Page 3

Attorney Docket No.: Q79997

Without agreeing to or substantively commenting on the remaining rejections of dependent claims 2-3, these claims are allowable at least by reason of their respective dependencies.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Chid S. Iyer  
Registration No. 43,355

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 28, 2006